

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL REPORTERS FOR THE FEDERAL COURTS

FEBRUARY 4, 1925.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
state of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5265]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill
H. R. 5265, after hearing and consideration report favorably thereon
and recommend that the bill do pass.

This bill provides for the appointment of official stenographers for
the Federal courts and will thereby bring the practice in those courts
in harmony with that which prevails in most of the States of the
Union. The bill provides that the compensation of such stenogra-
phers shall be prescribed by rules to be adopted by the district court
in each district, with the limitation that the compensation shall not
exceed that provided by law for the State courts in the State in
which such district court is held, if such law there be.

The bill also provides that the fees to be paid the stenographers by
the parties for transcripts, etc., shall be prescribed by the court in
each district with the same limitation that they shall not exceed those
paid to the State stenographers in the State in which said district
courts are held.

The bill is strongly indorsed by the American Bar Association and
there is quoted herewith and made a part of this report their recom-
mendation as contained in the report of the committee on jurispru-
dence and law reform.

OFFICIAL STENOGRAPHERS

In almost all the States of the Union the courts are provided with official
stenographers whose salaries are paid from the Public Treasury and who are
officers of the court as much as the clerks. We submit that they ought to be.
The introduction of stenography and typewriting is an improvement in the

method of administration. It has promoted the dispatch of business. Indeed, it is not too much to say that in the present conditions of business in this country the work of the courts could not be done without stenographers. What possible reason can be given for leaving this important part of judicial work entirely to the stenographers themselves and burdening suitors with its entire expense? It may well be that some part of the expense should be borne by suitors and that the time has not yet come or a requirement that transcripts of the stenographer's notes should be furnished without charge to suitors, but certainly the making of the notes is just as much a judicial function as the record of the clerk.

The bill in question leaves the appointment of the stenographers to the judges and provides that their compensation should be fixed by the district court in each district: "The compensation shall not exceed such as is now or may be hereafter provided by law in the State courts in the State in which such district court is held, if such law there be." A similar provision is made in regard to the fees for transcripts. The bill recognizes that the rates of compensation for stenographers and transcripts furnished by them vary in the different States and that it would be impracticable to regulate in detail the rates either by act of Congress or by rule of the Supreme Court. The fact that they are regulated in different States to the satisfaction of suitors there is the best measure of regulation for the Federal courts.

○